

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 8-18, and 65-70 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-18, and 65-70 of the Application stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Szlam et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. US 2002/0047859) (hereinafter "Szlam") in view of Bednarek et al. (U.S.P.N. 6,965,868) (hereinafter "Bednarek"). Claim 12 stands rejected under § 103(a) as obvious over Szlam in view of Bednarek and further in view of England (U.S.P.N. 6,144,991) (hereinafter "England"). In light of the Remarks, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

**Amendment to the Specification**

In accordance with the Examiner's request, the Applicant has amended the Abstract of the Application to contain fewer than 150 words.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Applicant has amended claims 1 and 65-70 to provide a proper antecedent basis for the "products" limitation. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under § 112.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaack, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

**Independent Claims 68, 69, and 70**

The Office Action rejects independent claims 68, 69, and 70 as obvious over Szlam in view of Bednarek. To support a rejection of claims 68-70 as obvious, the Office Action states:

Claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-18, and 65-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szlam et al. (US 2002/0047859 A1) in view of Bednarek (6,965,868 B1).

As per claims 1 and 65-70, Szlam discloses a method for selling goods and services in conjunction with the Internet (0003) comprising: receiving session information from an enterprise's website about a customer's session on the website, the website being associated with a selected one of a plurality of enterprises and the session information comprising the products the customer is searching ((0031, 0012), (0015, (0017-(0018), (0046), (0053)-(0072); determining from the session information and any customer information that the customer constitutes a sales opportunity appropriate for assistance from a sales associate (Figs. 2-7; (0053-0072); matching the customer with the sales associate, the sales associate being independent from the plurality of enterprises (Fig. 7; [0073]-[0074]); facilitating communications for a sales transaction between the customer and the matched sales associate via the internet (Fig. 7; [0073]-[0074] – Help screen has representative message “We have noticed that you have returned to this web page several times. Do you require assistance? If so, please type your question or the problem you are having and you will be immediately connected on-screen with a Customer Service Representative” – in response to returning to product screens, or similar message for remaining on an order screen); receiving sales information ([0074] and [0081] – Szlam discloses that the Customer Service Representative receives “sales information” that is delivered to the customer ms other appropriate messages forming the basis of the contact strategy or marketing campaign and is implicitly a part of the ability to deliver a targeted presentation to the customer used by the CSR to provide enhanced and more personalized service); providing the session, customer, and sales information to the matched sales associate based on the particular sales opportunity with the customer (Szlam does not explicitly disclose that this information is provided to the CSR).

Szlam does not specifically disclose that the sales associate receives sales information, or is provided the session, customer and sales information based on the particular sales opportunity with the customer. Bednarek discloses a method and apparatus where agents are matched in "outbound campaigns" to contact customers via the Internet, where the agents are provided sales information, session information and customer information based upon a sales opportunity (col. 85, lines 30-40). (Emphasis added).

Claims 68-70 of the Application each add one or more steps to those recited in claim 1. As seen above, the Office Action provides citations and reasons to support the Examiner's assertion that each step of claim 1 is disclosed by one or both of the cited references. However, the Office Action fails to reject or address those steps in independent claims 68-70 which further define claims 68-70 in comparison to claim 1.

**A. Claim 68 should be allowed because the Office Action does not reject each step of claim 68.**

Claim 68 was added by amendment in the Office Action Response mailed November 17, 2005 (hereinafter "Prior Response") which stated in relevant part:

The Applicants respectfully assert that claim 68 is allowable for at least one or more of the reasons given for the allowability of claim 1. Claim 68 is also allowable because it recites matching the customer to a list of the best sales associates, notifies the determined best sales associates, and enables the best sales associates to choose whether or not they assist the customer, i.e. the best sales associates get to 'race' to assist the customer. Prior Response, page 20.

As seen above, the Applicant asserted in the Prior Response that claim 68 was allowable for at least the reason that it recited steps enabling sales associates to "race" to a customer. To this end, claim 68 recites the steps of:

notifying the determined best sales associates that a sales opportunity regarding the customer exists;  
enabling each best sales associate to determine whether or not they wish to assist the customer;

matching the customer to the sales associate from among the determined best sales associates who first chooses to assist the customer; (Emphasis added).

The Office Action does not reject the notifying, enabling, and matching steps of claim 68. Thus, the Applicant asserts that claim 68 should be allowed for at least the reason that the Office Action does not reject every step of claim 68. Claim 68 is also allowable for at least the reasons given for the allowability of claim 1.

**B. Claim 69 should be allowed because the Office Action does not reject each step of claim 69.**

Claim 69 was added by amendment in the Prior Response, which stated in relevant part:

The Applicants respectfully assert that claim 69 is allowable for at least one or more of the reasons given for the allowability of claim 1. Claim 69 is also allowable because it recites the 'race' elements of allowable claim 68, and further incorporates a timeout which ensures that at least one of the best determined sales associates will be chosen to help the customer. Prior Response, page 20.

As seen above, the Applicant asserted in the Prior Response that claim 69 was allowable for at least the reason that it recited steps enabling a sales associate to "race" to a customer, and for at least the reason that claim 69 recited a "timeout" step. Claim 69 recites in relevant part:

notifying the determined best sales associates that a sales opportunity regarding the customer exists;  
enabling each best sales associate to determine whether or not they wish to assist the customer;  
matching the customer to the sales associate from among the determined best sales associates who first chooses to assist the customer;  
if a predetermined amount of time has passed and none of the best sales associates choose to assist the customer, selecting one from among the best sales associates who must assist the customer; (Emphasis added).

The Office Action does not reject the notifying, enabling, matching, and predetermined steps of claim 69. Thus, the Applicant asserts that claim 69 should be allowed for at least the reason that the Office Action does not reject every step of claim 69. Claim 69 is also allowable for at least the reasons given for the allowabilty of claim 1.

**C. Claim 70 should be allowed because the Office Action does not reject each step of claim 70.**

Claim 70 was added by amendment in the Prior Response, which stated in relevant part:

The Applicants respectfully assert that claim 70 is allowable for at least one or more of the reasons given for the allowability of claim 1. Claim 70 is also allowable because it recites operating a collateral materials database for use by matched sales associates. Prior Response, page 20.

As seen above, the Applicant asserted in the Prior Response that claim 70 was allowable for at least the reason that it recited steps drawn to a collateral materials database. Claim 70 recites in relevant part:

operating a collateral materials database for use by sales associates, wherein collateral sales materials include digital documents, web pages, executable programs, images, audio or video files, and Uniform Resource Locators;

recommending collateral sales materials to the matched sales associate which may be helpful to the sales process.

The Office Action does not reject the operating and recommending steps of claim 70. Thus, the Applicant asserts that claim 70 should be allowed for at least the reason that the Office Action does not reject every step of claim 70. Claim 70 is also allowable for at least the reasons given for the allowabilty of claim 1.

**Independent Claim 1**

**A. Claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose the matching step claim 1.**

Claim 1 recites a method for matching a customer with a particular sales associate for sales opportunities. Claim 1 recites in relevant part:

A method for selling goods and services in conjunction with the Internet, comprising:

matching the customer with a sales associate from among a plurality of sales associates based on the session information, the customer information, and information about the plurality of sales associates, the sales associates being independent from the plurality of enterprises; (Emphasis added).

To support a rejection of claim 1 as obvious, the Office Action states in relevant part:

As per claims 1 and 65-70, Szlam discloses a method for selling goods and services in conjunction with the Internet (0003) comprising:

...

matching the customer with the sales associate, the sales associate being independent from the plurality of enterprises (Fig. 7; [0073]-[0074]); (Emphasis added).

The primary reference to Szlam discloses a website help method which monitors factors indicative of a customer having problems using a company's website, where the factors include a customer profile, customer preferences, the time a customer spends on a web page, errors in forms submitted on the company's website, and the number of times a webpage is repeatedly viewed. Szlam [0012], [0059], [0062], [0064]. Based on the factors, Szlam connects a customer who needs help using the company's website to any CSR who is available, and uses phrases such as "determines whether a CSR is currently available", "connects the customer directly with an available CSR", and "a determination has already been made that a CSR is available." Szlam [0010], [0011], [0012], [0073], Fig. 7 at 705, 715. (Emphasis added). Szlam only discloses two types of CSRs – those who are available, and those who are not available, and does not

differentiate between CSRs who are available. Paragraph [0085] of Szlam similarly does not disclose matching a customer with a particular sales associate for a sales opportunity, but discloses VIP customers who receive browsing assistance “more quickly” than regular customers.

Page 10 of the Office Action states:

Contrary to applicant’s arguments, the company provides assistance dictated by customer profile (fig. 1, 125). Based on customer profile, the company matches the customer with a sales associate capable of delivering expert information that customer is looking for on a particular area of interest.

While Szlam discloses providing website help based in-part on a customer’s profile, Szlam does not disclose matching a customer with a particular sales associate for a sales opportunity. Therefore, as asserted in the Prior Response on pages 10-16, the Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 of the Application is allowable for at least the reason that Szlam does not disclose the matching step of claim 1.

Several steps of claim 1 recite a sales associate and/or sales opportunity limitation, which are important independently as well as integral to the matching and independently from the enterprises limitations. The Applicant asserts, as in the Prior Response at pages 16-17, that Szlam only discloses connecting a customer with the first available customer service representative for the purpose of providing help using a website, and does not disclose sales associates or sales opportunities as recited in claim 1. Thus, the Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that the customer service representatives of Szlam which provide help using the company’s website, for example, when the customer does not correctly submit a form, do not teach or disclose sales associates matched to customers for sales opportunities as recited in the matching step of claim 1.

To support a rejection of claim 1 as obvious, the Office Action asserts that Szlam discloses:

... the sales associate being independent from the plurality of enterprises (Fig. 7; [0073]-[0074]).

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Szlam does not disclose sales associates which are independent from the plurality of enterprises because Szlam discloses CSRs who are associated with "the company." Szlam discloses:

[0004] Many web sites have a "HELP" button, which allows the customer to "click on" or press that button in order to contact a customer service representative ("CSR") of the company.  
(Emphasis added).

As discussed in the Prior Response on pages 16 and 17, a CSR "of the company" is clearly not independent from the company. In view of the above Remarks, the Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 of the Application is allowable for at least the reason that Szlam does not disclose the independent from the plurality of enterprises element recited in the matching step of claim 1.

**Dependent Claim 3**

**A. Claim 3 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose each element of claim 3.**

To support a rejection of claim 3 as obvious, the Office Action states:

As per claim 3, Szlam discloses that customer information is received from a third party ((0014) – use of cookies to collect profile information, i.e. demographics, etc.).

The cited language from Szlam discloses:

[0014] The present invention may determine that a customer needs assistance through the use of cookies. A cookie is embedded in a web page so that when the web page is accessed by a customer for the first time, a cookie is sent to the customer's device. Then, when the customer accesses the web site in the future, the cookie is sent to the web host. Whenever predetermined web pages are opened by the customer, the cookie notifies the server of the identity of the customer. Further, the cookies may hold additional information about the customer including, for example, part or even all of the customer profile. This method is beneficial in that it frees up space on the company server as the customer profiles are maintained by



the customers in cookies on their own devices or computers, not on the company server. Further, the use of cookies can be expeditious in that the company web server need not access another company server (perhaps geographically remote from the company web server) to obtain the customer information. (Emphasis added).

The above cited language from Szlam discloses storing customer information in the form of cookies residing on the customer's computer. The cookie information is then read by a company server. Paragraph 14 makes no reference to a third party. By extension, paragraph 14 does not disclose receiving customer information from a third party. Thus, as asserted in the Prior Response on pages 17-18, the Applicant again respectfully asserts that claim 3 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited language from Szlam does not disclose the step of receiving customer information from a third party. The Applicant again respectfully requests that the Examiner clarify how Szlam's reference to cookies discloses receiving customer information from a third party as recited in claim 3. Claim 3 is also allowable for at least the reason that it depends from claim 1.

#### **Dependent Claim 4**

- A. Claim 4 should be allowed because the Office Action provides no source or rationale to disclose any element claim 4.**

To support a rejection of claim 4 as obvious, the Office Action states:

As per claim 4, Szlam discloses that the session information is parsed (Figs. 1-7) and that the agent provided can be determined by rules so that the best available agent is provided [0085]. However, neither Szlam nor Bednarek explicitly discloses that this segmentation is in accordance with product accreditation achieved by sales associates or that each sales associate is present with different types of sales opportunity depending on the product accreditation.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have parsed the session information in accordance with product accreditations and presented the sales associate with the appropriate type of sales opportunity depending upon the product accreditation, i.e. the best fit, as taught in Szlam

and Bednarek because it provides the enterprise with the best utilization of its resources, provides the customer with the most knowledgeable sales representative and increases the likelihood of a sale through customer satisfaction. Such best fit routing, funneling, is well-known in the call center art. (Emphasis added)

Claim 4 recites:

The method of claim 1, wherein the session information is parsed and segmented in accordance with product accreditations achieved by sales associates, whereby each sales associate is presented with different types of sales opportunities depending on the product accreditation of the sales associate.

As seen above, the Office Action states that “neither Szlam nor Bednarek explicitly discloses that this segmentation is in accordance with product accreditation achieved by sales associates.” The Office Action states that neither of the two asserted references disclose claim 4, and then the Office Action concludes that claim 4 is obvious without providing any source or rationale to teach, disclose, or render obvious claim 4. Accordingly, the Applicant asserts that claim 4 should be allowed because the Office Action provides no basis for the rejection of claim 4. Claim 4 is also allowable for at least the reason that it depends from claim 1.

**Dependent Claims 8-11**

**A. Claims 8-11 are allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose each element of claims 8-11.**

The Examiner rejects claims 8-10 as obvious over Szlam in view of Bednarek. With regard to claims 8-10, the Office Action states:

As per claims 8-10, Szlam discloses facilitating bridging out from Internet communication between the customer and sales associate to another mode of communication between the customer and sales associate ([0010] – CSR may communicate with the customer via various media including, but not limited to, electronic chat, e-mail, multi-media/presentation form exchanges, voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP), voice over Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) and fax).

Claim 8, which depends from claim 1, recites in relevant part:

facilitating bridging out from Internet communication between the customer and sales associate to another mode of communication between the customer and sales associate.

Szlam at paragraph 10 discloses:

[0010] The present invention provides for connecting a customer to a CSR when the customer presses a HELP button, especially when the customer should be offered assistance and when the company can offer assistance. The CSR may communicate with the customer via various media including, but not limited to, electronic chat, e-mail, multi-media/presentation form exchanges, voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP), voice over Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) and fax.

Paragraph 10 of Szlam discloses a CSR communicating with a customer using one of various methods, such as e-mail or fax. In contrast, claim 8 recites bridging out from an Internet connection between the customer and sales associate to another mode of communication. In other words, claim 8 recites a sales associate communicating with a customer over the Internet, and then changing or bridging out to a different mode of communication. Thus, the Applicant asserts that claim 8 is allowable for at least the reason that Szlam does not teach or disclose bridging out from Internet communication to another mode of communication as recited in claim 8. The Applicant also respectfully asserts that claim 8 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable claim 1. Claims 9-11 depend from claim 8 and so are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable claim.

**Dependent Claim 14**

A. Claim 14 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose each element of claim 14.

To support a rejection of claim 14 as obvious, the Office Action asserts regarding Bednarek that:

Bednarek discloses that sales information is provided to the sales agent is determined based upon enterprise (Business) rules and internal media layer provides information about the customer or contact, information about current or historical business processes, information about current interactions and their relationship to business processes, and a knowledge base to guide the agent (cols. 12; 37-38). (Emphasis added).

Bednarek at column 12, lines 34-39 only discloses:

The service level can be even further improved if the customer can pay from an existing account balance or credit line so that the customer need not enter purchase information (such as account numbers every time they make a purchase).

Claim 14 recites:

The method of claim 1, wherein the sales information comprises product information, catalog information, and external information.

The Applicant does not understand how the cited language from Bednarek is relevant to claim 14 nor how the cited language discloses "sales information is provided to the sales agent is determined based upon enterprise (Business) rules and internal media layer provides information about the customer or contact, information about current or historical business processes, information about current interactions and their relationship to business processes, and a knowledge base to guide the agent."

Upon review of the Prior Office Action it appears that the rejection of claim 14 was copied from the Prior Office Action and the reference to Beck changed (but not the citations) to Bednarek. Accordingly, the citations to Bednarek are nonsensical and clearly not relevant to claim 14. Thus, claim 14 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not teach or disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the sales information comprises product information, catalog information, and external information as recited in claim 14. Claim 14 is also allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable claim 1.

**Dependent Claim 15**

- A. Claim 15 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose each element of claim 15.**

To support a rejection of claim 15 as obvious, the Office Action states:

As per claim 15, Szlam does not explicitly disclose that some of the sales information is obtained from the enterprise. Bednarek discloses that some of the sales information is obtained from the enterprise, further that the sales information provided to the agent is enterprise (business) role dependent based upon the type of model desired and the situation (see abs.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized information obtained from the some of the sale information obtained from the enterprise with the sales agent as disclosed in Bednarek and in Szlam, as it is an enterprise business decision based upon business rules as taught in Bednarek. (Emphasis added).

The Abstract of Bednarek discloses:

A personal communication and electronic commerce system for use by participating users and participating merchants in connection with incentive programs in the Network Economy. The system includes a cellular communication network that includes geographically spaced base stations that are linked to a fixed communication network. Users may have personal communication devices that can be used to allow a digital message generated on the personal communication devices by placing a call through one of the base stations and memory for storing a digital value corresponding to a monetary value. The personal communication device may also be used as a cellular position locator to determine one's geographic location and, if desired, to access information from a merchant information database containing information pertaining to a plurality of participating merchants located within the geographic territory covered by the cellular communication network. The merchant information may be stored on a database that is accessible by merchants so those merchants can add, delete or alter information contained in their respective listings. An incentive system is also provided for creating incentives for participating users to encourage. This computer implemented incentive program for encouraging certain participant actions

includes a first reward program under which participants may earn points for certain actions and a second reward program through which the redemption rate associated with a particular participant is adjusted in response to certain participant action. The incentive program has a wide range of applications, including transportation, financial services and computer gaming.

The Applicant is unsure how the above-cited language is relevant to claim 15 and asserts that the above-cited language does not disclose “obtaining sales information from an enterprise or providing sales information to the agent is role dependent upon the type of model desired and the situation” as asserted in the Office Action. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that claim 15 is allowable for at least the reason that the above-cited language does not disclose the method of claim 1 wherein some of the sales information is obtained from the enterprise as recited in claim 15. Claim 15 is also allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable claim 1.

**Dependent Claim 16**

- A. Claim 16 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose each element of claim 16.**

To support a rejection of claim 16 as obvious, the Office Action states:

As per claim 16, Szlam, does not disclose that some of the sales information is obtained from a third party. Walker discloses that some of the sales information is obtained from a third party, further discloses that the sales information provided to the agent is enterprise (business) rule dependent based upon the type of model desired and the situation (cols. 21, lines 1-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized information obtained from the some of the sale information obtained from the third party with the 'sales agent ms disclosed in Bednarek in Szlam, as it is an enterprise business decision based upon business rules as taught in Bednarek. (Emphasis added).

The Applicant is confused by the reference to Walker, which is not asserted as a reference in the Office Action. To facilitate examination of the Application, the Applicant will

assume that the Examiner is referencing U.S.P.N. 5,794,207 to Walker (hereinafter "Walker"), which was cited in an Information Disclosure Statement submitted by the Applicant on August 23, 2002. Accordingly, Walker at column 21, lines 1-11 discloses:

At step 1330, central controller 200 establishes buyer account 297 which either stores money transferred by the buyer or serves as a pointer to an account of the buyer outside the system. For buyers using credit cards, for example, buyer account 297 contains the credit card number, expiration date, and name of issuing institution. Buyers could also transfer money to central controller 200 to be stored in buyer account 297, which would operate like a conventional checking account. Central controller 200 would send a check to the seller written on buyer account 297.

The Applicant is unsure how the above-cited language is relevant to claim 16 and asserts that the above-cited language does not disclose obtaining sales information from a third party as recited in claim 16. Thus, the Applicant asserts that claim 16 is allowable for at least the reason that the above-cited language does not disclose the method of claim 1 wherein some of the sales information is obtained from a third party as recited in claim 16. Claim 16 is also allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable claim 1.

**Dependent Claim 17**

**A. Claim 17 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose each element of claim 17.**

To support a rejection of claim 17 as obvious, the Office Action states:

As per claim 17, Szlam does explicitly disclose that the sales information provided to the sales associate is pertinent to the sales opportunity based on the characteristics of the sales opportunity. Bednarek discloses that the sales information provided to the sales associate is pertinent to the sales opportunity based on the characteristics of the sales opportunity because it affords the sales agent the ability to begin mental preparation before taking the call (col. 9) and provides seamless integration between the multimedia and application, type, thereby allowing agents to respond intelligently and efficiently to customers, as well as maximizing agent efficiency (cols. 3-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized pertinent sales information with the sales agent as taught in Walker with the method of Szlam/Bednarek for the specific reasons set forth in Walker. (Emphasis added).

Upon review of the Prior Office Action, it appears that the rejection of claim 17 was copied from the Prior Office Action and the secondary reference changed (but not the citations) from Beck to Bednarek. Accordingly, the citations to Bednarek are nonsensical and clearly not relevant to claim 17. Columns 3 and 4 are in the Background of the Invention section of Bednarek and do not disclose, and are not relevant to, claim 17. Column 9 of Bednarek provides a list of references cited by Bednarek, and is not relevant to claim 17. Thus, claim 17 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not teach or disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the sales information provided to the sales associate is pertinent to the sales opportunity based on the characteristics of the sales opportunity, as recited in claim 17. Claim 17 also allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable claim 1.

**Dependent Claim 18**

**A. Claim 18 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose each element of claim 18.**

To support a rejection of claim 18 as obvious, the Office Action states:

As per claim 18, Szlam does not teach that the sales information provided to the sales associate is associated with the results of a previous sales opportunity and there is a dynamic re-ranking of the aggregate sales information in terms of selling effectiveness which is incorporated in the sales information provided to a next sales associate presented with a similar opportunity. Bednarek teaches providing sales information to a sales associates associated with the results of a previous sales opportunity and there is a dynamic re-ranking of a previous sales opportunity in terms of selling effectiveness provided to the next sales associates incorporated into the sales information so that the interaction with the client can lead to a more productive interaction, i.e. a purchase (col. 32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the sales information associated with the results of a previous sales



opportunity of Beck into the method of Szlam/Bednarek for the explicit reasons set forth in Bednarek. (Emphasis added).

Upon review of the Prior Office Action, it appears that the rejection of claim 18 was copied from the Prior Office Action and the reference to Beck changed (but not the citations) to Bednarek. A citation to Beck appears as in the Prior Office Action, although Beck is not an asserted reference in the Office Action. Accordingly, the citation to column 32 of Bednarek is nonsensical and clearly not relevant to claim 18. Thus, claim 18 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not teach or disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the sales information provided to the sales associate is associated with the results of a previous sales opportunity and the association produces a dynamic re-ranking of the aggregate sales information available in terms of selling effectiveness, and results of the re-ranking are automatically incorporated into the sales information provided to a next sales associate presented with a similar sales opportunity, as recited in claim 18. Claim 18 also allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable claim 1.

**Dependent Claims 2, 5, and 13**

**A. Claims 2, 5, and 13 are each allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose each element of claims 2, 5, and 13.**

Claims 2, 5, and 13 each depend from claim 1 and so are allowable for at least the reason that each depends from an allowable independent claim.

**Independent Claim 65**

**A. Claim 65 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose each element of claim 65.**

As stated in the Prior Response on page 19, claim 65 is allowable for at least the reasons given for the allowability of claims 1 and 3.

**Independent Claim 66**

- A. Claim 66 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose each element of claim 66.

As stated in the Prior Response on page 20, claim 66 is allowable for at least the reasons given for the allowability of claims 1 and 4.

**Independent Claim 67**

- A. Claim 67 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose each element of claim 67.

As stated in the Prior Response on page 19, The Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 67 is allowable for at least the reasons given for the allowability of claims 1 and 8.

**Dependent Claim 12**

- A. Claim 12 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose each element of claim 12.

To support a rejection of claim 12 as obvious, the Office Action relies on Szlam, Bednarek, and England. Regarding Szlam and Bednarek, the Office Action states:

As per claim 12, Szlam does not explicitly disclose that the sales associate has the capability to manipulate the customer's navigation of the Internet. Bednarek discloses that the agent may create and edit web form, embed controls into sub web-based forms or pages to provide certain customer interaction mechanism in addition to having a fully functional navigation tool at his disposal, i.e. the agent can manipulate the client's computer over the Internet. (Emphasis added).

The Office Action provides no citation or reason to support the assertion that Bednarek discloses "that the agent may create and edit web form, embed controls into sub web-based forms or pages to provide certain customer interaction mechanism in addition to having a fully functional navigation tool at his disposal, i.e. the agent can manipulate the client's computer over the Internet." The Applicant searched Bednarek and found no reference to the words "web

form", "embed controls", or "navigation." This incoherence flows from the fact that the rejection of claim 12 appears to have been copied from the Prior Office Action and the secondary reference changed from Beck to Bednarek. Accordingly, the assertions regarding Bednarek are nonsensical and clearly not relevant to claim 12. Thus, the Applicant asserts that claim 12 is allowable for at least the reason that the cited references do not teach the method of claim 1 wherein the sales associate has the capability to manipulate the customer's navigation of the Internet as recited in claim 12. Claim 12 is also allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable claim 1.


CONCLUSION

The Applicant strongly desires to materially advance examination of the Application based on a complete and reasoned rejection, objection, or allowance of each of the pending claims. In view of the Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Applicant believes it has not received a complete and reasoned rejection of each claim. Nevertheless, to advance examination of the Application, the Applicant has attempted to reply to each rejection in good faith, and respectfully asserts that each of the pending claims is allowable over the cited references.

No fee is believed due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-0629.

Respectfully submitted,

NEEDLE & ROSENBERG, P.C.

  
Jason S. Jackson  
Registration No. 56,733

NEEDLE & ROSENBERG, P.C.  
Customer Number 23859  
(678) 420-9300  
(678) 420-9301 (fax)

<sup>1</sup> The citations and arguments in the Office Action are not surprising in light of the fact that in a March 21, 2006 telephone discussion with the undersigned attorney, the Examiner stated that he was not going to spend any more time on the present Application despite the fact that the Office Action failed to address independent claims 68-70.